

# READER

## COMPARATIVE RATING FORM

There are so many criteria to be measured in choosing a microfilm reader that decision-making often can be difficult.

There are two sections. In the space below, physical factors that should be considered are indicated, except for a rating as to general appearance in styling for the

various office locations in which the readers will be installed. Needed data can be routinely and objectively filled into the spaces provided for each reader.

On the adjacent page, a series of important operating features are listed in the form of brief questions. Some of the characteristics must necessarily be appraised subjectively, while others can be objectively rated by investigation or by physical tests.

### Design Considerations

The optical and illumination systems in a reader are surprisingly complex in order to achieve efficient readability. There are always conflicting design considerations which

require some degree of compromise in the design of the final product. For example:

An inexpensive lens of small aperture may be compensated for when a higher wattage lamp is chosen. But this in turn creates heat problems, making a ventilating blower necessary, etc.

Inexpensive lenses have certain definite characteristics which often bring on compromises in the total reader design. Choice of a poor wide-angle lens results in poor edge-to-edge readability; choice of a poor lens of longer focal length improves sharpness at the expense of increasing overall reader size or reducing screen size. The real key to truly readable reader design depends on optimum lens design.

It is strongly recommended that a thorough effort be made to evaluate all of the Operating Factors suggested. Only then can the buyer know for sure whether the final deci-

sion has favored the reader that is truly well-balanced and soundly designed.

### Scoring Procedures

There are two ways the Operating Features can be rated in the spaces opposite each of the factors. A grading system, such as Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor, can be used, and a final evaluation roughly approximated. More definitive ratings can be obtained by scoring numerical values in each column for each feature, assigning 10 as a top figure for a factor or 9, 7, 5 or 0 as the case may be. It

should be recognized that in some instances a top score of 10 may be assigned to more than one reader being rated (for example, for Feature #9, if more than one piece of equipment operates without a blower). Then, the total of the 16 scores for the factors being rated should be added to obtain a total comparative score.

### PHYSICAL FACTORS

	Reader A	Reader B	Reader C
	Manufacturer	Manufacturer	Manufacturer
	Stock No.	Stock No.	Stock No.
Overall Size . . . . . Height . . . . .	"	"	"
Width . . . . .	"	"	"
Depth . . . . .	"	"	"
Actual Desk Surface Occupied			
Width . . . . .	"	"	"
Depth . . . . .	"	"	"
Weight . . . . . lbs.	"	"	"
Screen Size . . . . . Height . . . . .	"	"	"
Width . . . . .	"	"	"
Cabinet Width . . . . .	"	"	"
Carrier Size . . . . . Width . . . . .	"	"	"
Depth . . . . .	"	"	"
Accepts Microfiche . . . . .			
Aperture Cards . . . . .			
Magnification . . . . . x	"	"	"
Price . . . . . \$	"	"	"

Approved For Release 2002/05/08 : CIA-RDP75-00163R000100060059-8

Approved For Release 2002/05/08 : CIA-RDP75-00163R000100060059-8

**TOTAL SCORE (All Factors)**